



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

illustrations of Regulus's avarice, Pliny goes on (2.20.12)

ἀλλὰ τί διατρέινομαι, 'Why do I exert myself in a State where laziness and rascality have long enjoyed no smaller rewards, or rather greater rewards, than modesty and virtue?'

Another example is in a letter to a friend whom he asked to look over an oration of his own (7.12.2):

'I send it to you rather late so that you may not have time to mend it, that is, to spoil it. But you will have time, whether to amend it, I don't know, but at any rate, to spoil it. *Τμείς γὰρ οἱ εὐζηλοί*, "for you studious people prune away all the best parts".'

In a letter to Trajan Pliny reports his safe arrival at Ephesus in these words: Nuntio tibi me Ephesum cum omnibus meis *ὑπὲρ Μαλέαν* navigasse quamvis contrariis ventis retentum (10.15). The use of the Greek words may have been suggested by a reminiscence of allusions in Greek literature to the dangers of Malea. Another phrase, *πάντα λίθον κινῶ* (1.20.16), 'I move every stone', i.e. make every possible effort, sounds like a common proverb or quotation, but has not been discovered in precisely this form in any Greek author. Professor Merrill compares it with Euripides, *Heraclidae* 1002.

Two Greek words are found in remarks which Pliny quotes, enough to show that foreign phrases had their place in Roman conversation as well as in literary composition. One is the laconic *κέκρικα* with which Corellius Rufus emphasized his determination of voluntary death (1.12.10). Another example, which seems to have less point, is the Emperor's injunction to some senators who were in council with him in a case of a forged will (6.31.12), *ἐπιστήσατε* quid facere debeamus, 'Determine what we ought to do'.

SMITH COLLEGE,
Northampton, Mass.

SIDNEY N. DEANE.

(To be concluded)

REVIEWS

Manuel D'Archéologie Romaine. By Cagnat and Chapot. Tome Premier. Les Monuments, Décoration des Monuments, Sculpture. Paris: A. Picard (1917). Pp. xxvi+735. 15 Francs.

This is the first genuine manual of Roman archaeology in any language and the testing of it as a text-book in my advanced course on Roman archaeology last year has convinced me that it will long remain the most useful book on the subject. Jones's excellent Companion to Roman History (of which much use is made in this volume), Sandys's very good work, A Companion to Latin Studies, Ramsay and Lanciani's Manual of Roman Antiquities, Walters's Art of the Romans, and Mrs. Strong's Roman Sculpture have much archaeological information, and there are better books on the Fora and on Roman architecture and methods of construction; but there is as yet no good handbook covering the whole field of Roman archaeology, as this important French publication will cover it.

No better scholars than Cagnat and his brilliant pupil Chapot, with their unusually wide experience in archaeological and historical researches, not only in the Roman antiquities of Italy, but of Britain, Gaul, Germany, Greece, Asia Minor, and Africa (which, thanks to Cagnat, occupies much space in the volume), could have been found for such a task. Cagnat's Manual of Roman Epigraphy and his *Inscriptiones Graecae ad Res Romanas Pertinentes*, and his publications on Timgad and on The Monuments of Tunis and other works, and Chapot's scholarly La Province Romaine Proconsulaire d'Asie and other publications have made the authors known as original and at the same time sane classical scholars. In the present volume they have not allowed their great learning to interfere with their producing not only a logical and scientific but an extremely practical handbook. There are no inappropriate discussions or digressions or useless accumulations of examples. The 371 illustrations are well-selected (several of those from Africa and elsewhere are not generally shown), but unfortunately the poor quality of the paper has in the case of several, which are reproduced from photographs, obscured the sharpness of detail.

After a suggestive Introduction concerning the meaning of Roman archaeology and some new and pertinent remarks (such as the remark on page xix that Rome owes no less to the Orient than to Greece), about Italian, Etruscan, Greek, Egyptian, Asiatic and Occidental influences, follow chapters on building materials, their use, roads, bridges and ports, villages, walls, and gates, cisterns, aqueducts, fountains and sewers, the Forum and its monuments, religious monuments (including altars, temples and chapels), places for spectacles (such as theaters, odeums, amphitheaters, circuses, and stadiums), baths, private and public, market-places and shops, libraries, camps and defenses of the frontier, honorific monuments (such as trophies and columns), private houses of village and country, and, finally, in Part I, Chapter XVI, funeral monuments. Part II deals in thirteen chapters with the technique of sculpture in the round and in relief, with the subjects treated by sculpture, divinities, imperial and other portraits, genre motives, decorative reliefs, reliefs with religious, funeral, historical, military, and genre subjects, and, finally, with the subjects on lamps, reliefs on stucco, and painted pottery. There is no index, but the systematic arrangement by chapters and sections and the use of many captions make an index unnecessary.

The book is thoroughly up-to-date and knows the latest literature, scattered as it is. Even sarcophagi in Baltimore (661) are described; and American scholars receive full credit for their work. Miss Van Deman's dating of imperial brick-faced constructions is accepted, Professor Frothingham's articles on the Arch of Constantine (*American Journal of Archaeology* 19 [1915], 367 ff.) are known, and even the dissertation

on Roman sacrificial altars, by a former student of mine at Bryn Mawr, Miss Bowerman, is cited several times, though her name is misspelt (136, 138). In the bibliography, arranged alphabetically, I miss only a few titles, such as Strzygowski, *Orient Oder Rom*, and *Kleinasien*, *Ein Neuland Der Kunstgeschichte*. For marbles (4, note 1) Lepsius, *Griechische Marmorstudien*, and Miss Porter's *What Rome Was Built With*, should have been included. Among the periodicals should be inserted *Ausonia*, *Bolletino d'Arte*, and especially the *Journal of Roman Studies* (the *Journal of Hellenic Studies* is given). There are a few misprints, but there are not many errors of fact. The temple of Castor is wrongly cited as the temple of Castor and Pollux (22, 145, 146). The illustration (24, Fig. 8) said to be taken from Choisy is somewhat different from that given by Choisy. A study of excavations at Ephesus, Miletus, Didyma, Pergamum, etc., would have qualified the statement (29) that Greece and Asia Minor were scarcely influenced by Roman methods of construction. The Appian Way does not still preserve its ancient pavement for the greatest part of its course (44). To the list of Roman bridges (48) might be added several, especially those in Syria published by Professor Butler, and there is more than one Roman bridge at Merida (50). The Sette Sale are on the Esquiline, not on the Aventine (87). We miss references to the four great reservoirs at Praeneste as well as to the Nymphaeum at Miletus (106). In the discussion of the Basilica and its origin (129) there is no reference to Lemaire, *L'Origine de la Basilique Latine* (1911). For the rostra (123, 148) there should be a reference to Miss Van Deman's paper in *American Journal of Archaeology* 13 (1909), 170 ff.; for the temple of Vesta (151) to her monograph on the Atrium Vestae. Agrippa should not be included among the adopted sons of Augustus in honor of whom the Maison Carrée was built. Only Gaius and Lucius Caesar are mentioned in the inscription (151). The rotunda of the Pantheon is not built of brick, but of brick concrete (153). It is difficult to see how the front row of eight columns, which is generally dated in the time of Hadrian or later, goes back to the Augustan Age, if the original portico was decastyle, as is said. Many scholars think that the inscription to Agrippa is a restoration of the time of Hadrian, who was fond of such restorations, and generally omitted his own name. For the sanctuary of the Syrian Gods on the Janiculum (163-164) refer also to Gatti in *Bull. della Com. Arch. Com.*, 1909, 97 f.; for Dougga (165 f.) refer to Carton's little book on Thugga. It is stated (173) that the first complete theater, in wood, is not older than 150 B. C., but I know of no such wooden theater earlier than that of M. Aemilius Scaurus built about 58 B. C., and hardly any Greek archaeologist believes that "chez les Grecs, l'action se passait, partie sur la scène, partie sur la plate-forme de l'orchestre, les acteurs occupaient la

scène", nor that the Romans (174) ignored the chorus (compare Miss Duckett, *Studies in Ennius*, 53 ff., and Professor R. C. Flickinger, *The Greek Theater and its Drama*, 117, 149). For Orange (183, 195, etc.) compare not only Caristie's work of 1856, but also Chatelain, *Les Monuments Romaines d'Orange* (1908). In the list of Roman theaters no account is given of the important Roman theater at Ephesus or of the unusually well-preserved and very impressive one excavated by the Germans at Miletus. For amphitheaters (192) refer also to Nissen, *Pompeianische Studien*, and Middleton, *Remains of Ancient Rome*. For the statement (193) that the balustrade was surmounted by rollers which turned on touching, we should have a reference to Calpurnius's seventh Eclogue, which is a very important literary source of information on amphitheaters. In a mention of the stadia of Asia Minor (207), that of Aphrodisias, the important Roman ruins of which are neglected, deserves notice, and among the baths (212 ff.) those at Miletus are lacking (compare plans in Wiegand's seventh report on excavations at Miletus, in *Abhandlungen Der König. Preuss. Akad.*, 1911). For a different meaning of *insula* as apartment or apartment house (292) a reference is needed to Cuq, *Une Statistique de Locaux Affectés à l'Habitation dans la Rome Impériale* (1915). *Honos* is not the only masculine abstract deity (461). *Bonus Eventus*, *Robigus*, *Dies Bonus*, *Pallor*, *Pavor* (Livy 1.27.7) are others. A reference is lacking to Axtell, *The Deification of Abstract Ideas in Roman Literature and Inscriptions*. It is interesting to see, in view of many statements to the contrary, that the authors believe that the Romans painted their statues (367-368). For Marciana (503), whose portrait occurs on coins, compare also the marble head in Boston (*Bulletin of Museum of Fine Arts*, Boston, 14 [1916], 36-38). No reference is made to Dennison's theory (*American Journal of Archaeology* 9.11-43) that the busts thought to represent Scipio (509) are really those of priests of Isis. For *Ara Pacis* (141, 624) refer to Studniczka's later work, *Zur Ara Pacis* (1909), as well as to Petersen (1902). Some scholars, who have recently been exaggerating the originality of Roman sculpture, especially in portraiture and historical reliefs, will be surprised that Mm. Cagnat and Chapot allow so little creative genius to the Romans and even attribute the reliefs on the Trajan column to Greek artists (641 ff.). But it is really true that the first idea of historical reliefs was not born at Rome. There are prototypes in Assyria, Persia, and many examples on Hellenistic and especially Pergamene reliefs (619). On the other hand (682) too much credit is given the Romans for being the first to decorate their lamps, for the Greeks often decorated the top or discus of their clay lamps with scenes in relief.

It would easily be possible to call attention to many more such small errors or omissions, but it would give

a false impression. I have noted a few points, however, to show that my opinion that this will long remain the best handbook of Roman archaeology is based on a careful reading and actual use of the book in the classroom. Students of Roman archaeology will await with eagerness the second volume, which will discuss painting and mosaic, and the third volume, which is to take up Roman Public and Private Life. France is to be congratulated on keeping up its classical scholarship in war times and producing such a handbook as this, as well as recently completing, with the help of Pottier, the most important dictionary of classical antiquities, Daremberg et Saglio's *Dictionnaire des Antiquités Grecques et Romaines*, to which Cagnat and Chapot have contributed many articles.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS
UNIVERSITY.

DAVID M. ROBINSON.

A History of Ancient Coinage 700-300 B.C. By Percy Gardner. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press (1918). Pp. xvi + 463. 11 Plates. \$7.20.

This is one of the most important books which have appeared in recent years in the field of classical archaeology. The science of ancient numismatics has undergone great development in the last fifty years and such important works as Head's *Historia Numorum*, Babelon's *Traité Des Monnaies Grecques*, and the twenty-seven volumes of the *Catalogue of Greek Coins in the British Museum* have blazed the way for the first real broad historical sketch of Greek coinage as an organic unity, by a scholar who is historian as well as numismatist, who takes (page x)

cities in groups rather than separately, tracing lines of trade influence from district to district, trying to discern the reasons why coin standards found acceptance in one locality or another.

More than sixteen years of association in the British Museum with Barclay Head (to whom the book is dedicated) and his own numerous researches have made Professor Percy Gardner one of our foremost authorities on Greek coins. His papers on the origin of coinage, and on the coinages of the Ionian revolt (in which he first identified a uniform coinage issued by the cities of Ionia which took part in the revolt against Persia in the years 500-494 B.C.), and his papers on the coinage of the Athenian Empire, showing Athens's pride and love of dominance (motives even to-day as strong as those of commercial advantage in world politics), have solved many a difficult problem. They have been rewritten and are incorporated in the present volume, the Introduction of which can be read with pleasure by laymen as well as scholar. This Introduction (pages 1-66) contains an account of Greek trade-routes, classes of traders, bankers, early measures of value, the origin of coin-standards, mutual relations of precious metals, rights of coinage, monetary alliances, mother-city and colony, standard currencies, monometallism and bimetalism, the dating of Greek coins, hoards, and fabrics. Then follows a more

detailed treatment, in Chapters I-XIII, of the First Period, 700 to 480 B.C., and in Chapters XIV-XXI, of the Second Period, 480-300 B.C. After the General Index there is a description of the coins shown on the Plates.

Aside from its originality and its treatment of really difficult problems the book is characterized by insistence on the significance of varieties of standards rather than on the attractiveness of types and symbols, and by dating coins with reference to definite historical events. For instance, Professor Gardner dates coins with the olive crown on Athena's helmet after the battle of Marathon and ascribes the earliest tetradrachms to Pisistratus and a great celebration of the Panathenaic festival (page 155). Decadrachms such as the famous *Damareteia* were issued only on the occasion of some great national triumph (163). The impoverishment of Athens due to the disastrous Sicilian expedition is marked by an issue of gold coins of necessity (291). The idea that the Chalcidian League (as Mr. Allen B. West has shown in *Classical Philology* 9 [1914], 24-34) existed as early as the time of Xerxes and was organized more firmly in 432 B. C. is confirmed by coins.

The book is full of good suggestions, though many are debatable. It may very likely be, though the literary tradition is not to be so lightly discarded, that coins originated with the Greeks of Asia Minor and not with the Lydians. The American excavations at Sardis so far have brought to light only two coins from the time of Croesus out of 419 Greek coins, but only sixteen of the 419 are from the Pre-Alexandrian period. Further digging in earlier strata may reveal early Lydian coins (see Mr. Bell's excellent and beautifully printed publication of Sardis coins, in Sardis, Publications of the American Society for the Excavation of Sardis, Volume XI, Part I, 1910-1914, a work published in 1916, to which Professor Gardner might have referred). In Europe it was the Aeginetans, the pedlars of Greece, who first struck money, not the Phoenician merchants, who did not need a coinage to dispose of great quantities of goods. Other statements are much less trustworthy, such as the idea (17) that the Greek temples could not lend money (compare the Sardis mortgage inscription, *American Journal of Archaeology* 16 [1912], 59). There are only a few minor errors, such as the statement on page 19 that at Athens 8 obols instead of 6 went to the drachm. On pages 18, 230, etc., the *Corpus of Inscriptions* should have been referred to as I. G., not as C. I. On page 230 Professor Gardner declares that "The best ruddle came from Ceos". But the Cean ruddle was not always considered the best; Pliny favors the Lemnian, Strabo the Sinopean or Sinopis. On pages 75, 224, 226, 438 there are misprints; on page 240 "westward" should be 'eastward'. On page 173 there is a wrong reference to the Plates ("VI. 11" for 'VI.9').